

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/575,524	04/12/2006	Manfred Blumberg	7701-0002WOUS	3660				
MCCORMICE	7590 07/28/201 C. PAULDING & HUB	EXAM	EXAMINER					
CITY PLACE	Í	PHAM,	PHAM, LUU T					
185 ASYLUM HARTFORD,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER					
,		2437						
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE				
			07/28/2010	PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/575,524	BLUMBERG ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
LUU PHAM	2437					

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE	REPLY	FILED	08	Ju	ly 2010	FA	ILS	TO I	PL	ACE	.TI	IIS AP	PLICATION	IN C	ONDITIO	ON F	FOR A	ALLOW	ANCE.	

- 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

- 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
 - appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
 - NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
- The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
- non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) X will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 - The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 - Claim(s) allowed:
 - Claim(s) objected to:
 - Claim(s) rejected: 1-2. 4, 7, 10-11, 14, and 26-27. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
- AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
- was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
- REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
- 13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Luu Pham/ Examiner, Art Unit 2437

Continuation of 3 NOTE:

Applicant's amendments to indepdent claims 7 include subject matter not previously set forth including but not limited to "multi-axis machine tool." In light of these amendments, further consideration and search are required for examination.

Continuation of 13. Other:

Applicants' arguments regarding the statutory subject of claim 7 have been fully considereed but they are not persuasive. Although the claim has been amended as "assigning... using a processor of a computer system," the claim is still directed in still directed matter because the claim is not tied to a particular machine. See e.g. Ex parte Marius A. Cornea-Hasegan, Appeal 2008.4742, pages 8-11. On the other hand, broadly interpreted, a processor of a computer system could be human and/or human's mind (e.g., see US 2010/00744315 or US 2010/0057876); Therefore, the steps of assigning could be completely performed mentally-verbaily by a user/operator/administrator. Therefore, the claim is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner respectfully suggests that the claim be further amended as "assigning... using a computing device" to make the claim statutory under 30 LSC. 101.

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner respectfully suggests that the claim be further amended as "A computer system comprising: a hardware processor; and a computer memory storing computer executable instructions, which when executed by the processor, cause the processor to perform the steps of: ..." to make the claim statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.